



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Mike Flanagan

DATE: May 30, 2006

SUBJECT: **APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL MEAP SOCIAL STUDIES ASSESSMENT AND MI-ACCESS HIGH SCHOOL ASSESSMENTS.**

The purpose of this State Board of Education item is to present the tentative performance standards that were set for the High School Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) social studies assessment and the MI-Access high school assessments. The procedures used to set the performance standards are described in this memorandum. The standard setting activities occurred in April and May of 2006.

The performance standards adopted by the State Board of Education will define the levels of performance on the High School social studies MEAP and the high school MI-Access assessments for all Michigan students. For MEAP, the levels are Level 1: *Exceeded State Standards*; Level 2: *Met State Standards*; Level 3: *Basic*; and Level 4: *Apprentice* (Not Endorsed). For MI-Access the levels are Level 1: *Surpassed the Performance Standard*; Level 2: *Attained the Performance Standard*; and Level 3: *Emerging Toward the Performance Standard*.

Standard setting activities were carried out in consideration of the standards already set for the grade 6 and grade 9 social studies MEAP to assist in obtaining a coherent system of standards in social studies.

Standard setting was carried out by panels of educators and other Michigan stakeholders working under the direction of the contractors for MEAP and staff of the Department. The panel spent two days reviewing each assessment instrument, individually judging the level of performance that students would need to achieve for each of the performance levels for each assessment, discussing these within their panel, and repeating this process three times, with additional performance information provided after the second round.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

Panelists made their final judgments individually, and the resulting recommendations are a compilation of these individual judgments. Panelists were then asked to indicate their confidence in the standards that they set and the processes used to set them.

A brief overview of the standard setting process is provided in Attachment A. Attachment B provides a summary of the results of the standard setting process in terms of the recommended cut scores for MEAP. Attachment C provides a summary of the panelists' evaluation of the process for MEAP. Attachment D provides a summary of the results of the standard setting process for MI-Access. Attachment E provides a summary of the panelists' evaluation of the process for MEAP.

The result of this effort is that the panels recommend performance standards for the high school MEAP social studies assessment and the MI-Access high school assessments.

The Michigan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC—comprised of nationally-recognized measurement and statistics experts), reviewed and endorsed the procedures used for and results of the MEAP standard setting on May 15, 2006. TAC reviewed and endorsed procedures for MI-Access standard setting on May 23, 2006. It also reviewed and endorsed the results for all recommended cut scores except for the *attained the performance standard* cut on the Participation assessment (the assessment for students with the most severe cognitive disabilities).

For that recommended cut score on the Participation assessment, the TAC indicated that after three rounds of standard setting, the panelists did not converge as much as for the other cuts (the process is not intended to produce consensus, but it often does). TAC further indicated that the recommended cut is consistent with all other grade level cuts for Participation, that the impact in terms of percentages attaining and not attaining the standard is consistent with all other grades. TAC further advised OEAA to review the results and to make a recommendation to the State Board of Education that is consistent with the purposes of the MI-Access Participation assessment and in the best interest of the State.

OEAA has reviewed the results, and recommends that the State Board of Education accept the attained the performance standard for Participation recommended by the standard setting panelists as (1) it is consistent with all other Participation cut scores across all grades assessed, and (2) the participation assessment does not change at all across grade levels.

The panels' recommended performance standards are presented to the State Board of Education for your discussion and approval.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the performance standards that were recommended by the standard setting panel for the High School MEAP social studies assessment (in attachment B) and the MI-Access High School assessments (in attachment D) and to use these performance standards in reporting the Spring 2006 results from those programs.

Standard Setting Process

Overview of MEAP and MI-Access Standards

This attachment gives a broad description of the process used to set standards on the MEAP. A thorough technical report is available upon request.

Overview of Standard Setting Panelists

For the High School MEAP social studies assessment, one panel of 20 panelists was seated for this standard setting activity. For the MI-Access High School assessments, one panel of 9 to 15 panelists was seated for each of the four assessments. Panelists were carefully selected to represent the diversity of Michigan teachers and other stakeholders. Care was taken to balance the panels in terms of grade level of teachers, ethnicity, gender, income, geographical region, and education. Panelists experienced with students with disabilities and English language learners were also carefully selected. In addition, panelists with curriculum and assessment expertise were recruited as were community members and parents of school children. Significant efforts were made to recruit from each of these groups to represent the diversity of Michigan MEAP stakeholders.

The Processes

For this standard setting activity, a method known as Bookmarking or Item Mapping was used. This process depends upon detailed descriptions of student performance, or Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs). PLDs were previously developed for High School MEAP social studies through a process involving Michigan stakeholders. These PLDs define the progression of what children can do at each performance level from one level to the next. In other words, these PLDs provided a guide to the MEAP standard setting panelists to determine into which performance level students with certain scores fit. The MEAP standard setting panelists used the PLDs to guide their work, but had the prerogative to modify the PLDs slightly to be aligned more completely with the content of the MEAP.

Bookmarking or Item Mapping

The first activity in Bookmarking was having the panelists actually take and score their own assessments. In this manner they become intimately acquainted with the assessments both in terms of content and difficulty. Following the assessment, panelists became familiar with the PLDs by studying the PLDs and the tasks on the assessment that elicit the knowledge and skills described by the PLDs. Panelists defined and became familiar with what it means to "just meet standards," "just exceed standards," and "just meet basic" requirements (or the equivalent for MI-Access performance levels).

Following familiarization with the PLDs, the panelists engaged in a practice activity that mimicked the activities in which they engaged for standard setting. This familiarized them with the process they used before they actually made any judgments about student performance.

At this point, panelists were given a booklet of assessment items from a specific grade that had been ordered by the difficulty of the items, from easiest to hardest, based on actual student performance on those items. The first task of the panelists was to independently determine in the ordered assessment booklet where students who "just met standards" move from being more likely to respond correctly to an item to being more likely to respond incorrectly to an item. At this point in the booklet, the panelist placed a "bookmark" indicating that he or she judged that this is the point where that transition is made.

Following this first round of judgments, the panelists were brought back together as a group to review and discuss the entire set of recommendations made by the panelists, including their rationales for making the judgments they made. A second round of judgments then took place. After the second round of judgments, panelists were also presented with impact data that indicated what percentage of students fell into each performance category based upon the mean of the group's recommended cut scores. Panelists were also given impact data for significant student subgroups (e.g. male/female, black/white). Given the discussion and impact data, the panelists then independently revised their recommendations in a third round of judgments.

To assist the panels in setting standards consistent with grades 9 social studies MEAP standards, a "reference bookmark" was placed in the ordered booklet to show where a standard equivalent to the grade 9 standards would be (based on the same percentages of students falling into each performance category as in previous years). Panelists were informed what this bookmark represents, but that they were free to recommend different cut scores based upon their study of the PLDs and the content of the assessments.

Results of the MEAP Standard Setting Process

Prior to this State Board of Education meeting, the results were presented to the Michigan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA). The TAC, which is comprised of nationally-known assessment and statistics experts, reviewed and approved the full results.

The results presented to the State Board of Education are comprised of the recommended cut scores. Other information is available to answer any questions including the complete final standard setting plan and technical report.

The Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability and the Assessment & Evaluation Services facilitators carefully monitored the process to assure that the panelists were focused upon the Performance Level Descriptors, upon the items on the assessments, upon student work on the assessments, and that all other parts of the approved process were followed. The Technical Advisory Committee also reviewed the process and found it to be psychometrically sound. Each entity stands behind the process that produced the recommended MEAP cut scores.

High School Social Studies MEAP Recommended Standards

Raw Score Ranges				
Apprentice	Basic	Meets	Exceeds	Anchor
0-14.5	15-20.5	21-32.5	33-51	Spring 2005 Base Form

Panelist Evaluations of the Standard Setting Process

Indicate the level of success of various components of the standard-setting session in which you participated:

Component	Blank	Not very successful	Partially successful	Successful	Very successful
Introduction to the Assessment	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
Performance Level review	0%	0%	65%	35%	0%
Process training	0%	5%	60%	35%	0%
Practice exercise	0%	0%	55%	45%	0%
Group discussions	0%	15%	50%	35%	0%
Data presentations	0%	15%	50%	35%	0%

Indicate the importance of each of these factors in making your cut-score recommendations:

Factor	Blank	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
Performance Level Descriptors	0%	15%	30%	55%	0%
Your perception of the difficulty of the assessment	5%	10%	65%	25%	5%
Your perception of the quality of student responses	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%
Your own classroom experience	5%	5%	65%	25%	5%
Your initial classification of student performance	10%	45%	35%	10%	10%
Panel discussions	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
Feedback data	0%	5%	40%	55%	0%
Policy environment	5%	35%	40%	20%	5%
What students should vs. would be able to do	0%	10%	40%	50%	0%

How confident are you in the classification of students at each level of proficiency?

Performance Level	Blank	Not confident	Somewhat confident	Confident	Very confident
Basic	0%	0%	0%		65%
Met	0%	0%	0%		20%
Exceeded	0%	0%	20%		25%

Results of the MI-Access Standard Setting Process

Assessment	Raw Score Ranges			Anchor
	Emerging	Attained	Surpassed	
Participation	0-13	14-18	19-20	Spring 2006 Base Form
Supported Independence	0-14	15-20	21-24	Spring 2006 Base Form
Functional Independence ELA	0-26	27-37	38-45	Spring 2006 Base Form
Functional Independence Mathematics	0-23	24-33	34-40	Spring 2006 Base Form

Panelist Evaluations of the MI-Access Standard Setting Process

Indicate the level of success of various components of the standard-setting session in which you participated:

Component	Not very successful	Partially successful	Successful	Very successful
Introduction to the MI-Access assessment	0%	0%	48%	52%
Standard-setting process intro. - large group	0%	0%	40%	60%
Performance Level Descriptor review	0%	3%	49%	49%
Standard-setting orientation - small group	0%	6%	38%	57%
Practice exercise on item mapping	0%	3%	44%	54%
Group discussions of the panel	0%	3%	45%	52%
Data presentations before rounds 2 & 3	0%	1%	33%	66%

Indicate the importance of each of these factors in making your cut-score recommendations:

Factor	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
Performance Level Descriptors	0%	8%	38%	54%
Your perception of the assessment's difficulty	0%	10%	33%	57%
Your own professional experiences	1%	14%	32%	53%
Your initial judgments (round 1)	1%	21%	42%	36%
Group discussions of the panel	0%	7%	32%	61%
Feedback data provided to the panel	0%	7%	22%	71%
Policy environment in the State	10%	23%	39%	28%

How confident are you with your *personal* classification of students at each level?

Round	Not confident	Somewhat confident	Confident	Very confident
Surpassed the standard	4%	6%	40%	50%
Attained the standard	3%	4%	33%	60%
Emerging toward the standard	3%	1%	41%	55%